

FILED

FEB 12 2021

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
SAN ANTONIO DIVISION

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
BY [Signature] DEPUTY CLERK

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

CRIMINAL NO. \_\_\_\_\_

v.

**SA 21CR0077XR**  
INFORMATION

MICHAEL WIBRACHT

[Vio.: 18 U.S.C. § 371 Conspiracy]

Defendant.

CRIMINAL INFORMATION

The United States of America, acting through its attorneys, charges:

1. MICHAEL WIBRACHT is hereby made a defendant on the charge stated below.

COUNT ONE  
[18 U.S.C. § 371]

INTRODUCTION

At all times relevant to this Information, unless otherwise stated:

2. The Small Business Administration ("SBA") was an agency of the United States. The SBA was authorized by law to develop programs and promulgate regulations to assist small businesses, including by having programs that offered contracts set aside for certain business owners, such as small business owners, service disabled veterans, and socially and economically disadvantaged individuals, commonly referred to as "set-aside programs" and their "set-aside contracts."

3. The SBA's Service Disabled Veteran Owned Small Business ("SDVOSB") and 8(a) programs were among such "set-aside" programs that offered such "set-aside" contracts.

4. The SBA's SDVOSB program's purpose was to increase the number of government contracts awarded to small businesses owned and controlled by service-disabled

veterans. To qualify as an SDVOSB, a company, among other things, was required to have been owned and controlled by a service disabled veteran ("SDV"), that is, a United States veteran with a disability that was incurred in the line of duty in the active military, naval, or air service. Small businesses that are owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans are known as SDVOSBs. A qualified SDVOSB was eligible to receive government contracts that were only available to SDVOSBs.

5. The SBA's 8(a) program provided business development assistance to socially and economically disadvantaged small businesses, including help in obtaining federal contracts set aside for businesses that qualified under the 8(a) program. To qualify for contracts set aside under the 8(a) program, a company, among other things, was required to have been owned and controlled by a United States citizen who met the SBA's definition of being socially and economically disadvantaged. If a company qualified for the 8(a) program, it was eligible to receive government contracts that were only available to 8(a) businesses.

6. For a business to qualify for contracts set-aside for a SDVOSB, 8(a) business, or any other small business, it must qualify under SBA rules as a "small business."

7. By law, a small business is owned by a qualifying person when the person unconditionally and directly owns at least 51% of the business.

8. By law, a small business is controlled by a qualifying person when the person (1) conducts the long-term decision-making, (2) conducts the day-to-day management and administration of the business operations, (3) holds the highest officer position in the business, and (4) has managerial experience of the extent and complexity needed to run the business. The qualifying person must also manage the business on a full-time basis working normal hours typical of that business.

**DEFENDANT AND CO-CONSPIRATORS**

9. Company M, a Texas Corporation in the construction business, claimed 8(a) status to obtain federal government 8(a) set-aside and sole-source contracts from approximately May 1998 through to approximately May 2007. After 2007, Company M was no longer qualified to compete for contracts set aside under the 8(a) program. Company M continued to conduct business with the federal government, but not as a company with 8(a) status.

10. Company BH, a Texas Limited Liability Company in the construction business, claimed SDVOSB status to obtain federal government Small Business and SDVOSB contracts, from at least 2004 through to at least January 2018.

11. Company JV, a Texas Limited Liability Company in the construction business, claimed 8(a) status to obtain federal government Small Business and 8(a) contracts from at least October 2006 through to at least October 2015.

12. Company MC, a Texas Limited Liability Company in the construction business, claimed 8(a) status to obtain federal government Small Business and 8(a) contracts from at least 2009 through to at least January 2018.

13. Company F, a Texas Limited Liability Company in the construction business, was formed in approximately 2010 to provide services to Company BH; Company M; and other companies affiliated with Co-Conspirator 1 and Defendant, including Company JV and Company MC.

14. Co-Conspirator 1 was an owner of Company M and Company F.

15. Defendant was, at various times during the relevant period, a part owner of Company M, Company F, and Company BH.

16. Ruben Villarreal was, at various times during the relevant period, identified on paper as the majority or sole owner of Company BH.

17. Over the course of the conspiracy, Co-Conspirator 1 and Defendant held out two different service-disabled veterans, one of whom was Ruben Villarreal, as the majority or sole owners of Company BH. Company BH fraudulently claimed Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business status to obtain federal government SDVOSB set-aside contracts.

18. Various entities and individuals, not made defendants in this Information, participated as co-conspirators in the offense charged herein and performed acts and made statements in furtherance thereof.

#### **SCHEME TO DEFRAUD**

19. Beginning at least as early as April 16, 2004, Co-Conspirator 1 and Defendant entered into a conspiracy to:

a. Use or cause to be used interstate wire communications in the execution of a scheme to defraud in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1343;

b. Defraud the United States by obtaining money from the United States, and agencies thereof, by means of false and fraudulent pretenses, representations, and promises; and

c. Defraud the United States of and concerning its governmental functions and rights, by interfering with the lawful function of the SBA and other U.S. government agencies, by deceit, craft, trickery, and means that were dishonest, including fraudulently securing through Company BH valuable government contracts set aside for small businesses from U.S. government agencies, when Co-Conspirator 1 and Defendant and their businesses were not eligible to obtain those contracts, thereby impeding, impairing,

defeating, and obstructing the lawful function of the SBA and other U.S. government agencies.

20. Beginning at least as early as April 16, 2004, Defendant knowingly entered into and engaged in the conspiracy with Co-Conspirator 1 and others; the conspiracy lasted until at least November 22, 2017.

**MANNER AND MEANS**

21. For the purpose of carrying out the charged conspiracy, Co-Conspirator 1, Defendant, and other co-conspirators:

- a. Identified persons who would qualify for Small Business, SDVOSB, and 8(a) programs, and established those persons as the ostensible owners of construction companies, including Company BH, Company JV, and Company MC;
- b. Held out Company BH to the SBA and other U.S. government agencies as qualified for set-aside contracts, when in truth and in fact Company BH was not qualified due to its control by Co-Conspirator 1 and Defendant, and affiliation with other companies controlled by Co-Conspirator 1 and Defendant;
- c. Solicited set-aside contracts from the federal government through bids submitted by Company BH;
- d. Exercised disqualifying financial and operational control over Company BH;
- e. Made false statements and representations to the contracting federal government agencies about the qualifications of Company BH;

f. Concealed that Co-Conspirator 1 and Defendant, persons not eligible as business owners for SBA contracting preferences, exercised disqualifying control over Company BH;

g. Concealed from the contracting federal government agencies the disqualifying control that non-qualifying, affiliated, Company F and Company M, and other companies controlled by Co-Conspirator 1 and Defendant, exercised over Company BH;

h. Made false statements to federal government agencies to conceal that Company BH, Company M, and Company F were affiliated, and that Company BH, therefore, exceeded the size limitation for small businesses and was ineligible for set aside contracts;

i. Caused to be transmitted wire communications in interstate commerce, including but not limited to e-mails, certifications, and invoices to agencies of the United States, and money transfers from agencies of the United States; and

j. Obtained millions of dollars for Company BH in set-aside contracts as a result of false, misleading, and concealed conduct.

#### **OVERT ACTS**

22. Within the Western District of Texas and elsewhere, in furtherance of the above described conspiracy, and in order to carry out the objects thereof, Co-Conspirator 1, Defendant, and other co-conspirators, known and unknown to the United States, committed the following overt acts, among others:

a. On or about April 16, 2004, caused the organization of Company BH, identifying a service-disabled veteran as the manager and majority owner of Company BH, and identifying Co-Conspirator 1 and Defendant as part-owners of Company BH;

b. On or about October 2006, caused the organization of Company JV, and established as the ostensible owner of Company JV an individual who would appear to qualify under the government's 8(a) set-aside program;

c. On or about January 1, 2008, created documents reflecting that Villarreal was the majority owner of Company BH, thereby replacing another service-disabled veteran as the ostensible majority owner of Company BH;

d. On or about September 30, 2008, caused Company M, Company BH, Company JV, and Company MC to enter into an indemnity agreement in order to obtain bonding from a surety for construction projects, whereby Co-Conspirator 1 and Defendant agreed to indemnify the surety on behalf of Company BH; and Co-Conspirator 1 agreed to indemnify the surety on behalf of Company JV, and Company MC;

e. On or about August 13, 2009, created documents reflecting that Villarreal was the sole owner of Company BH;

f. In or about 2008, caused the organization of Company MC, and established as the ostensible owner of Company MC an individual who would appear to qualify under the government's 8(a) set-aside program;

g. On or about September 13, 2013 and September 18, 2013, in connection with a bid protest against Company BH concerning an SDVOSB contract with the United States Department of Veteran Affairs worth more than \$20 million, caused Company BH to prepare and submit to the SBA a document signed by Ruben Villarreal, which

contained false statements regarding Company BH's affiliation with Co-Conspirator 1, Defendant, Company M, and Company F;

h. On and between approximately April 25, 2006 and December 1, 2017, caused Company BH to enter into set-aside contracts with federal agencies, resulting in Company BH receiving contracts valued at approximately \$250 million in federal funds;

i. On and between approximately April 13, 2007 and November 3, 2017, caused Company JV to enter into set-aside contracts with federal agencies, resulting in Company JV receiving contracts valued at approximately \$190 million in federal funds;

j. On and between approximately May 29, 2009, and May 4, 2018, caused Company MC to enter into set-aside contracts with federal agencies, resulting in Company MC receiving contracts valued at approximately \$60 million in federal funds;

k. Caused to be transmitted wire communications in interstate commerce, including e-mails, certifications, invoices, and money transfers; and

l. On or about November 22, 2017, caused Company BH to receive final payment of approximately \$74,431.72 from the United States Department of Veteran Affairs on a SDVOSB contract worth more than \$20 million.

ALL IN VIOLATION OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 371.

**NOTICE OF UNITED STATES' DEMAND FOR FORFEITURE**  
**[See Fed.R.Crim.P. 32.2]**

**I.**

**Wire Fraud Violations and Forfeiture Statutes**

**[Title 18 U.S.C. §§ 371, 1343, subject to forfeiture pursuant to Title 18 U.S.C. § 981(a)(1)(C), made applicable to criminal forfeiture by Title 28 U.S.C. § 2461(c)]**



As a result of the foregoing criminal violations set forth in Count One, the United States gives notice to Defendant of its intent to seek the forfeiture of the property described below upon conviction pursuant to Fed. R. Crim. P. 32.2 and to Title 18 U.S.C. § 981(a)(1)(C), made applicable to criminal forfeiture by Title 28 U.S.C. § 2461, which states:

**Title 18 U.S.C. § 981. Civil forfeiture**

(a)(1) The following property is subject to forfeiture to the United States:

\* \* \*

(C) Any property, real or personal, which constitutes or is derived from proceeds traceable to . . . any offense constituting "specified unlawful activity" (as defined in section 1956(c)(7) of this title), or a conspiracy to commit such offense.

Wire Fraud is an offense constituting "specified unlawful activity" as defined in Title 18 U.S.C. § 1956(c)(7)(A).

**Title 28 U.S.C. § 2461.**

(c) If a person is charged in a criminal case with a violation of an Act of Congress for which the civil or criminal forfeiture of property is authorized, the Government may include notice of the forfeiture in the indictment or information pursuant to the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure . . . .

**II.**

**Money Judgment**

A sum of money which represents the proceeds obtained, directly or indirectly, from the violations set forth in the Count referenced above for which the Defendant is solely liable.

**III.**

**Substitute Assets**

If any of the property described above as being subject to forfeiture for the violations set forth above, as a result of any act or omission of defendants:

- a. cannot be located upon the exercise of due diligence;
- b. has been transferred or sold to, or deposited with, a third party;

- c. has been placed beyond the jurisdiction of the court;
- d. has been substantially diminished in value; or
- e. has been commingled with other property which cannot be divided without difficulty;

it is the intent of the United States of America to seek forfeiture of any other property, up to the value of the money judgment, as substitute assets pursuant to Title 21 U.S.C § 853(p) and Fed.

R. Crim. P. 32.2(e)(1).



---

RICHARD A. POWERS  
Acting Assistant Attorney General  
Antitrust Division  
U.S. Department of Justice




---

MARVIN N. PRICE JR.  
Director of Criminal Enforcement  
Antitrust Division  
U.S. Department of Justice



---

JAMES J. FREDRICKS  
Chief, Washington Criminal II Section  
Antitrust Division  
U.S. Department of Justice



---

MATTHEW C. STEGMAN  
HEATHER DIEFENBACH CALL  
DANIEL E. LIPTON  
Trial Attorneys  
Antitrust Division  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Washington Criminal II Section  
450 5<sup>th</sup> Street NW  
Washington, DC 20530  
Tel: (202) 598-8381  
matthew.stegman@usdoj.gov  
heather.call@usdoj.gov  
daniel.lipton@usdoj.gov